

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Figure 3 has been amended to delete the reference 380 in the replacement sheet submitted herewith for the Examiner's approval.

Solely in order to expedite prosecution, claims are presented in a form which is believed to be more preferred by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Again, solely in order to expedite prosecution, claims 67 and 71 are presented in a form which is believed to be more preferred by the Examiner. However, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 29 are directed to a method and properly recite the operation of "receiving." As such the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is improper and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Independent claims have been amended to additionally incorporate claim 4. It is respectfully submitted that *Kinjo* does not teach capturing a selected game presentation frame.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that *Kinjo* does not teach or suggest: "collaboratively executing a game of chance" (claim 2). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper for this additional reason.

It should be noted that the dependent claims recited features that render them patentable over the cited art for additional reasons. For example, claim 8 recites: detecting an event corresponding to the outcome of a game of chance that triggers the capture of a selected game presentation frame. It is respectfully submitted that the cited art does not teach or suggest this feature.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation or suggestion for combining the references. Clearly, the mere assertion that

the references can be combined to derive a beneficial result is not enough to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In the present case, the mere assertion that: “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the game unit of Kinjo with the game of chance of Takemoto et al. in order to increase the entertainment value by allowing players to print out stickers of their game screen featuring the player’s image” (Office Action, page 7, paragraph 3) is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P038X1). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/RMahboubian/  
Ramin Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001